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Note to the Reader

The following abbreviations are used in this report:

- APlus: Academic Plus Georgia 21st CLC Database
- CISDC: Communities in Schools of Douglas County
- DCSS: Douglas County School System
- CERS: Center for Evaluation and Research Services
- CHMS: Chapel Hill Middle School
- CLMS: Chestnut Log Middle School
- TMS: Turner Middle School
- GaDOE: Georgia Department of Education
Quality program evaluation requires collaborative work with a number of people. Special thanks go to Mitzi Teal for the leadership and support provided to the schools as well as for the assistance provided in planning and implementing the evaluation. Thanks also goes to Site Coordinators Cheronda Minnis-Arnold, Jane Rookard, Alicia Boyard, Claudia Copeland, and Mikki Lucas for their willingness to help with the evaluation. Without their help and cooperation, the program evaluation would not be possible. Special thanks go to the students, parents, teachers, and staff members who participated in the surveys.
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1.1 Program Overview

In May of 2022, the Douglas County School System, in partnership with Communities in Schools of Douglas County, completed the third year of its 21st Century Community Learning Centers grant program funded by the Georgia Department of Education. The program, known as FOCUS, serves students at Chapel Hill Middle School (CHMS), Chestnut Log Middle School (CLMS) and Turner Middle School (TMS). FOCUS is strategically designed to increase student academic skills, improve self-esteem, and provide exposure to life-skills through hands-on activities. Educational experiences provided through the FOCUS program are specifically designed to instill in the student a lifelong love of learning. Additionally, all of the activities take place in a safe and productive environment.

1.2 Program History

A total of 25 students were served at CHMS. Of these, 23 attended the CHMS program for 30 days or more. At CLMS, a total of 62 students were served, with 53 attending for 30 days or more. Finally, at TMS, a total of 77 students were served, with 67 attending for 30 days or more. The target enrollment for CHMS (50) was not met; however, CLMS (53) and TMS (55) met their target enrollments. In total, there were 164 students \((25 + 62 + 77 = 164)\) served in the FOCUS program, with 143 regular attendees \((23 + 53 + 67 = 143)\). The total attendees of the FOCUS program are shown by grade level in Figure 1.
Program Goals, Objectives, Activities, and Benchmarks

The goals, objectives, activities, and benchmarks of FOCUS are summarized in Table 1.

### Table 1. FOCUS Goals and Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Tools</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1. Improve Academic Achievement</td>
<td>Objective 1.1 50% of regularly participating students (attending the program 30 days or more) will score at or above the 40+ proficiency percentile on local district assessment for READING/ELA.</td>
<td>a) Daily &amp; weekly monitoring,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 1. FOCUS Attendees by Grade Level 2021-2022. Source: APlus Information System.](image-url)
| Objective 1.2 | 50% of regularly participating students (attending the program 30 days or more) will score at or above the 40+ proficiency percentile on local district assessment for MATH. |
| Local District Assessment | a) Homework Assistance  
b) Computer based assessments/activities & Enrichment sessions  
c) Accelerated Reader Reports  
d) Local assessment |
| Objective 1.3 | Of the 21st CCLC students participating in the program 30 days or more, 75% will exhibit an annual academic improvement from or maintain (A, B, or C) or (2,3) in Math as measured by the school report card. |
| Progress notes each three weeks, report cards each six weeks | a) Progress report evaluations with classroom teachers  
b) Agenda book messages with missing assignments  
c) Remedial help needed and student goal setting  
d) STAR Reading assessment |
| Objective 1.4 | Of the 21st CCLC students participating in the program 30 days or more, 50% of the participants will exhibit an annual academic improvement, individual student growth with their Reading Lexile’s Scores |
| Lexile data from STAR 360 | a) Progress report evaluations with classroom teachers  
b) Agenda book messages with missing assignments  
c) Remedial help needed and student goal setting  
d) STAR Reading assessment |
| Goal 2. Increase student involvement | a) Pre-program surveys, parent and teacher surveys  
  Report card feedback and comments  
  a.) Agenda book messages with homework listed and missing assignments noted  
  a.) Daily agenda message review and homework messages.  
  b.) Every-two weeks grade book review
### Objective 2.2. At least 80% of 21st CCLC Grant students participating in the program 30 days or more participating in the program will demonstrate improvement or maintain satisfactory behavior by the end of the school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.) Agenda book message checks</td>
<td>a.) Daily agenda review throughout the school year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.) Speakers, counseling services, conferencing, Role playing activities, character development seminars</td>
<td>b.) Program schedules showing youth development activities held weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.) Teacher survey to measure progress</td>
<td>c.) Pre and post (at end of ye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goal 3. Increase family involvement

#### Objective 3.1. 50% of registered active parents will attend 2 or more parent education sessions per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Newsletter</td>
<td>a) Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schedule of parent education sessions,</td>
<td>b) Schedule/calendar of activities, APLUS adult registration, and attendance records. 1 hour parent sessions for a minimum of 6 sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Parent activity interest survey</td>
<td>c) Administered at parent orientation and survey at end the year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Objective 3.2. Of the family members who participate in 3 or more family involvement / education / literacy activities, 50% will report increased engagement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Event sign in sheet</td>
<td>a) Collected at each parent session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Schedule of parent education sessions,</td>
<td>b) Schedule event posted each month in APLUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Parent survey</td>
<td>c) Parents will be given an evaluation survey at the end of the year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1 Evaluation Overview

The Center for Evaluation and Research Services (CERS) is the independent, third party evaluator for the FOCUS program. A part of the Georgia State University College of Education & Human Development, CERS supports faculty, students, and other educational agencies with proposal development, research design, and external evaluation. CERS is currently managing large federal grants and has personnel with over 30 years of grant experience combined, including evaluation of large federal and state grants.

There were two main purposes for the FOCUS evaluation during 2021-22: (1) to provide detailed information about the continuing FOCUS program implementation to the program director and site coordinators and (2) to assess the progress of the program in meeting the goals and objectives as outlined in the grant proposal during the current year of implementation.

2.2 Use of Evaluation Findings

Schools

Data were collected during the year, and special efforts were made to establish a safe and effective learning environment conducive to academic achievement. Additionally, staff made an effort to communicate clear expectations to all stakeholders, including students, parents, faculty, and staff. Prior to the opening of the 2022-23 school year, the evaluation of objectives and information obtained from the staff interviews and parent, staff and student surveys will be shared with the FOCUS teachers at a preplanning faculty meeting. In addition, results will be shared with the grant advisory committee, parents, and other key stakeholders.
Project Director, Site Coordinators and Douglas County School System

1. This year Cheronda Minnis-Arnold completed her sixth year and Jane Rookard finished her fourth year as co-site coordinators for CHMS. Alicia Boyard her fifth year as TMS coordinator. Also, Mikki Lucas is site coordinator at CLMS, finishing her third year. The Project Director meets with the site coordinators on a regular basis to review program operations and identify areas that need to be improved. The site coordinators also participate in professional development implemented by the Project Director. The Project Director has attended sustainability training, coaching for continuous improvement, youth driven spaces promoting youth voice and grant writing sessions in additional to other relevant training.

2. The Project Director reports evaluation findings to the school district and works with instructional staff at the district level to include 21st CCLC programs and evaluation results in the District School Improvement plan. An LEA Implementation Plan is created from district-level and school-specific trend data analysis. This analysis becomes a part of the Consolidated Application-Comprehensive Plan of the district.

3. The Project Director presents data and evaluation results to the Communities in Schools of Douglas County Board of Directors at quarterly meetings. The role of this volunteer Board is to identify ways of supporting the school improvement plan though suggestions for additional partnerships and financial support through donations.

4. During July 2022, the Project Director will lead a meeting of the grant coordinators to analyze student assessment data in order to create an improvement plan that addresses each school’s individual academic needs. This plan coupled with the previous year’s evaluation results will inform the implementation of the 21st CCLC program for 2022-2023.
2.3 Evaluation Methods

2.3.1. Parent Survey

During spring 2022, a survey was administered to the parents and guardians of students who participated in the FOCUS after-school program. Parents and guardians were given and encouraged to complete the survey via email or as a paper survey. Reminders were sent to encourage completion of the survey.

The purpose of the survey was to assess the level of interest and involvement of parents and guardians. The survey instrument was a 10-item, 5-point Likert-type scale survey with agree-disagree options:

The completion rates for the Parent survey are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Parent Survey Completion Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHMS</th>
<th>CLMS</th>
<th>TMS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Surveys Completed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Regular Attendees at the School Site</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Completed per Regular Attendees</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2. Regular School Day Teacher Survey

During spring 2022, an online survey was administered to the regular-school-day teachers of the student participants within the FOCUS after-school program. The purpose of the survey was to assess whether regular-school-day teachers believed that student participants’ behavior related to academic performance had changed during their involvement with FOCUS this year. The survey has 10 items on a 5- or 6-point scale. The 6-point rating scale is as follows: 1 (significant improvement), 2 (some improvement), 3 (no change), 4 (some decline), 5 (significant decline), and 6 (did not need to improve).

Twenty-two Teacher Survey results regarding the participant were received
from teachers at CHMS, 61 from CLMS, and 45 from TMS, for a total of 128 responses to the teacher survey.

2.3.3. After-School Worker Survey

During spring 2022, a survey of actions aptitudes and confidence levels was administered to after-school workers who participated in the FOCUS program. The survey consisted of seven items measured on the following points: 1 (confident in my skill/ability in this area), 2 (with some review, can deliver this type of assistance), 3 (limited knowledge/experience), and 4 (not applicable). A total of 37 after-school workers completed the survey.

2.3.4. Student Survey

During spring 2022, a survey of actions and attitudes was administered to students who participated in the FOCUS after-school program. The purpose of the surveys was to gauge the actions and attitudes of students toward school and whether those actions and attitudes had changed over the year.

The survey has 10 items on a 5-point scale. The 5-point rating scale points ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The completion rates of the student survey are summarized in Table 3.

A student who is termed a regular attendee by the state has attended the program for 30 days or more but may not be a currently active participant in the program. For example, a student who registered for the FOCUS program in September and attended through January would be a regular attendee as defined by the state, but he or she might have withdrawn from the program and school during the administration of the spring survey.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHMS</th>
<th>CLMS</th>
<th>TMS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Surveys Completed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students Targeted by the Grant Application</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students Active at the Time of Student Survey</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Completed per Active Students</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>104%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.5. Site Visit

The evaluators conducted a virtual interview with all three schools in the fall of 2021 and an onsite interview in spring of 2022. The purpose of the site visits was to interview the site coordinator(s) and collect information on the implementation of the program from the perspective of the site coordinator and observe the program as it was being implemented.

2.3.5. Other Techniques

Throughout the year, the evaluation team used other techniques to gather data. Those additional techniques included the following:

1. Monthly discussion with Project Director
2. Collected and analyzed secondary data gathered from the APlus Information System
3. Collected and analyzed secondary data gathered from DCSS.

2.3.6. Data Collection Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Activity</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
<th>Spring 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After-School Worker Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Day Teacher Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of APlus Information System Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Data Collection Schedule.*
3.1 Program Activities

The goals of the FOCUS program were to create an academic learning environment, increase student academic performance in an effort to bridge the academic gap, increase student engagement, and increase adult family members participation in school activities. During the school year many uncharted issues due to the pandemic, hybrid program implementation and virtual implementation made the program very difficult to meet the enrollment targets and may have increased preparation and costs to effectively serve the participants. The program director and site coordinators of the FOCUS program worked with community organizations, such as Communities in Schools of Douglas County, to maximize resources for students participating in the program.

The activities of the FOCUS program focused on the whole child, first to encourage belonging and social awareness and then to increase academic achievement, creativity, and student motivation. The primary activities of the FOCUS program, as identified in the APlus Information System, are listed below. Other activities are described in the formative evaluation reports for fall and spring.

- Activity Enrichment Center
- Intensive Academic Activities (Math)
- Intensive Academic Activities (Reading)
- Homework Assistance
- ELA Boot Camp
- Math Boot Camp
- Parent Education
- Parent Literacy and Involvement
- Structured Recreation
- Math Sense
- Character Development
- Cultural Arts
- Civil Engineering Simulation
- Jewelry & Arts and Crafts
- Hip Hop Dancing
3.2 Program Operation

Table 4

Summary of Program Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Total No. of Weeks Open</th>
<th>Typical No. of Days per Week Open</th>
<th>Typical No. of Hours per Week</th>
<th>No. of Summer Weeks Open</th>
<th>Typical Hours per Summer Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHMS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLMS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All subgrant programs were operating from 9/2/2021 to 5/12/2022.
3.3 Student Attendance and Enrollment

During the school year, 164 students attended the FOCUS program for one day or more. The numbers of days attended by students are summarized in Figure 3. Of the students who attended the FOCUS program for one day or more, 21 (13%) attended for fewer than 30 days. Some of these were highly mobile families that attend school and move often. Of the students who attended the FOCUS program for one day or more, 143 (87%) attended for 30 days or more and are defined as Regular Attendees.

Figure 3. Student Attendance Rates. Source: APlus Information System.
3.4 Student Demographics

The demographic information for the 164 students who participated in the FOCUS program is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHMS No. of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not English Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: APlus Information System

3.5 Student Attendance

The average daily student attendance was 20 students for CHMS, 35 students for CLMS, and 47 for TMS (APlus Information System).
3.6 Adult Family Member Attendance

During the school year, the FOCUS program served 133 adult family members. The attendance pattern of these family members are shown in Figure 4. Barriers to parent participation include a lack of transportation to events and long, inflexible work hours during events. This year, 99 of the 133 parents (74%) indicated they attended two or more events this year.

![Bar chart showing parent event attendance]

*Figure 4. FOCUS Parent Event Attendance. Sources: Parent Attendance.*
3.7 Program Staff

Table 6

*Ratios of Students to Teacher*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHMS</th>
<th>TMS</th>
<th>YMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>12:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>15:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>15:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sources. DCSS & Evaluator Site Visits.*
4.1.1 Academic Performance: STAR Assessments

The STAR Assessments for ELA and MATH are used to provide standardized assessment results for English Language Arts and Math for selected students who participated in the FOCUS program at CHMS, CLMS, and TMS.

The STAR Reading Assessments were administered in the fall for baseline scores, at the midpoint, and at end of year. Thus, there were three reading scores indicating the progress of the students in reading for the year. Many of the participating students started the year well below the 40% proficiency score established by the STAR analysis. The goal is to help students reach the goal; however, progress toward the goal when the student starts at a deficit is also an indication that the program is working.

STAR ELA scores were provided for 134 students who attended the FOCUS Program, 23 from CHMS, 54 from CHMS, and 57 from TMS. These scores indicate that most of the students (65%) increased their ELA STAR Score between the baseline and EOY assessment points. Regarding the goal of Proficiency, the FOCUS ASP fell short of the goal; however, a majority of students increased in score. For CHMS 2 of 23 (9%) were at the 40th percentile or above, CLMS had 9 of 54 (17%), and WES had 13 of 57 (23%). For STAR there were 24 of 134 (18%) students at or above the 40th percentile.

In 2022, the Lexile scores were released for the participating students. The Lexile score is an indication of the student’s reading ability on the Lexile scale from 5L to 2000L. Georgia has estimated bands of Lexile scores equivalent to the student’s grade level. The following tables examine the Lexile scores by grade and site.

In FOCUS there were total students with Lexile scores, 28% (39/138) of those students had Lexile scores within the estimated reading band or greater for their grade placement. However, the student growth in Lexile scores may be an indication of academic growth by students in the CCLC program. Typically, the students in need of the CCLC ASP are also in need of structures to help them grow academically. In CHMS, 5 of 23 (22%) students placed in grade 3 Lexile equivalents or lower as indicated by the beginning Lexile level. For CLMS, 21 of 57 (37%) placed in grade 3 or below, and in TMS 12 of 58 (21%) placed in grade 3 or below. This starting point for most of the FOCUS students makes it very challenging for students to reach...
the grade equivalent band goal. The students in each band who display growth from the fall to spring Lexile scores are identified and the percent of positive growth is assessed by examining those increases. The students whose scores are within the state estimated Lexile grade bands or exceed that grade band will be the benchmark for acceptable student Lexile scores this year and the percentage of students that indicate growth will be an indication of the developmental nature of the CCLC program. Therefore, students displaying academic growth in Lexile development are identified by an increase in Lexile score from fall to spring scores. CHMS identified 18 of the 23 (78%) students with Lexile scores as increasing from fall to spring. CLMS identified 34 of 57 (60%) students with an increase, and TMS identified 38 of 58 (66%) students showing an increase in Lexile scores from fall to spring. Within FOCUS, 90 students of 138 (65%) showed an increase in Lexile scores from fall to spring.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Lexile Band</th>
<th>Score Classification</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Band</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>925 to 1070</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>970 to 1120</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1010 to 1185</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHMS LEXILE SCORES by Grade Band**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Lexile Band</th>
<th>Score Classification</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Band</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>925 to 1070</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>970 to 1120</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1010 to 1185</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLMS LEXILE SCORES by Grade Band**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Lexile Band</th>
<th>Score Classification</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Under Band</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>925 to 1070</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>970 to 1120</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1010 to 1185</td>
<td>Within Band</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceed Band</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TMS LEXILE SCORES by Grade Band**
The STAR Math Assessments were administered in the fall for baseline scores, at the midpoint, and at end of year. Thus, there were three math scores indicating the progress of the students in math for the year. Many of the participating students started the year well below the 40% proficiency score established by the STAR analysis. The goal is to help students reach the goal; however, progress toward the goal when the student starts at a deficit is also an indication that the program is working.

STAR Math scores were provided for 126 students who attended the Focus Program, 23 from CHMS, 52 from CLMS, and 51 from TMS. These scores indicate that most of the students 88/126 (70%) increased their Math STAR Score between the baseline and EOY assessment points. Regarding the goal of Proficiency, the FOCUS ASP fell short of the goal; however, FOCUS had a majority of students increase in score. For CHMS 8 of 23 (35%) were at the 40th percentile or above, CLMS had 28 of 52 (54%), and TMS had 19 of 51 (37%). For STAR there were 55 of 126 (44%) students at or above the 40th percentile.
4.1.2 Academic Performance: GMAS

During the school year, some students completed the GMA for reading and math and were classified as beginning, developing, proficient or distinguished. The following is an update of those results. For FOCUS there were 138 students that took the GMA reading and 137 that took the math sections (Chapel Hill Middle – 22; Chestnut Log Middle – 53 Reading and 52 Math; and Turner Middle- 63). The following graphs show the schools and the total number of students for FOCUS for reading and math.
Focus Milestones Results For Math

BEGINNING
- CHMS: 11
- CLMS: 32
- TMS: 61

DEVELOPING
- CHMS: 12
- CLMS: 18
- TMS: 17
- FOCUS: 68

PROFICIENT
- CHMS: 0
- CLMS: 2
- TMS: 5
- FOCUS: 8

DISTINGUISHED
- CHMS: 0
- CLMS: 0
- TMS: 1
- FOCUS: 1
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4.2 Academic Performance: Grades

One of the objectives of the FOCUS program is to increase academic performance. This directly related to the grades earned during the 1st semester compared to the grades earned during the 2nd semester of program participants.

As shown in Figure 5, 65% (15/23) of students that were regular attendees in the CHMS after-school program during 2021-22 either increased their grade or maintained an A, B, or C average for the school year on report card grades in ELA. Additionally, 87% (20/23) of students that were regular attendees in the CHMS after-school program during 2021-22 either increased their grade or maintained an A, B, or C average for the school year on report card grades in math.

*Figure 5. CHMS Report Card Grades Change from fall to spring. Source: DCSS.*
As shown in Figure 6, 78% (43/55) of students that were regular attendees in the CLMS after-school program during 2021-22 either increased their grade or maintained an A, B, or C average for the school year on report card grades in ELA. Additionally, 87% (48/55) of students that were regular attendees in the CLMS after-school program during 2021-22 either increased their grade or maintained an A, B, or C average for the school year on report card grades in math.

*Figure 6. CLMS Report Card Grades Change from fall to spring. Source: DCSS.*
As shown in Figure 7, 64% (39/61) of students that were regular attendees in the TMS after-school program during 2021-22 either increased their grade or maintained an A, B, or C average for the school year on report card grades in ELA. Additionally, 70% (43/61) of students that were regular attendees in the TMS after-school program during 2021-22 either increased their grade or maintained an A, B, or C average for the school year on report card grades in math.

*Figure 7. TMS Report Card Grades Change from fall to spring. Source: DCSS.*
As shown in Figure 8, 70% (97/139) of students that were regular attendees in the FOCUS After School Program during 2021-22 either increased their grade or maintained an A, B, or C average for the school year on report card grades in ELA. Finally, as shown in Figure 8, 80% (111/139) of students that were regular attendees in the FOCUS After School Program during 2021-22 either increased their grade or maintained an A, B, or C average for the school year on report card grades in math. In Figure 8, the report card grades change for ELA and math for the individual schools are an aggregation of Figures 5, 6, and 7.

Figure 8. Report Card Change Summary for FOCUS.
Reporting GPRA Measures for FOCUS

**GPRA 1 (a). Percentage of students in grade 4-8 participating in 21CCLC programming during the school year and summer who demonstrate growth in reading and language arts on State assessments.**

In comparing the State Milestones ELA scores from 2021 to 2022 there is little change in the level (Beginning, Developing, Proficient, and Distinguished) for the students in grades 6, 7, and 8 participating in the FOCUS ASP. Academic growth in ELA can better be evidenced by an increase in the ELA STAR assessment during subsequent administrations in 2022. There is strong evidence that links the STAR assessment to the State Milestones. In the FOCUS program there were 87 of 133 (65%) students that increased in their STAR ELA assessments in 2022.

**GPRA 1(b). Percentage of students in grade 4-8 participating in 21CCLC programming during the school year and summer who demonstrate growth in mathematics on State assessments.**

In comparing the State Milestones Math scores from 2021 to 2022 there is little change in the level (Beginning, Developing, Proficient, and Distinguished) for the students in grades 6, 7, and 8 participating in the FOCUS ASP. Academic growth in Math can better be evidenced by an increase in the Math STAR assessment during subsequent administrations in 2022. There is strong evidence that links the STAR assessment to the State Milestones. In the FOCUS program there were 87 of 129 (67%) students that increased in their STAR Math assessments in 2022.

**GPRA 2. Percentage of students in grades 7-8 and 10-12 attending 21CCLC programming during the school year and summer with a prior-year unweighted Grade Point Average (GPA) of less than 3.0 who demonstrated an improved GPA.**

The students in FOCUS in grades 6 through 8 did not receive a cumulative grade for all subjects showing GPAs in the range of 1.0 to 4.0 for the prior year. However, we can refer to the improvement in grades reflected in their report card grades for ELA and Math for 2022. From the 1st semester to 2nd semester during school year 2021-22. In 2022, 97 of 139 (70%) of students either increased or maintained an A, B, or C in ELA and 111 of 139 (80%) of students either increased or maintained an A, B, or C in Math.

**GPRA 3. Percentage of students in grades 1-12 participating in 21CCLC during the school year who had a school day attendance rate at or below 90% in the prior school year and demonstrated an improved attendance rate in the current school year.**

In FOCUS there were 36 students who had an attendance rate lower than 90% in 2021, and 34 of 36 (94%) improved attendance in 2022.
GPRA 4. Percentage of students in grades 1-12 attending 21CCLC programming during the school year and summer who experienced a decrease in in-school suspensions compared to the previous school year.

In FOCUS there were 7 of 140 students who were in ISS during 2021. Of those 7 students 1 (14%) experienced a decrease in ISS events during 2022.

GPRA 5. Percentage of students in grades 1-5 participating in 21CCLC programming in the school year and summer who demonstrated an improvement in teacher reported engagement in learning.

In FOCUS there no students in grades 1-5. N/A
4.3 Involvement of Adult Family Members

In spring of 2022 a survey was administered to the adult family members of students who participated in the FOCUS program. The purpose of the survey was to assess whether their involvement and interest in the education of their student(s) had changed over the year. Survey responses are summarized below.

- 94% of the parents who responded indicated they strongly agreed or agreed the FOCUS helped their child to complete homework.
- 91% of the parents who responded indicated they strongly agreed or agreed the FOCUS helped their child to improve in reading.
- 91% of the parents that responded indicated they strongly agreed or agreed the FOCUS helped their child to improve in math.
- 77% of adult family members who responded to the survey reported that the after school program has helped their child’s behavior in school.
- 97% of adult family members who responded to the survey reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the program.
4.4 Student Observation by Regular-Day Teacher

In spring of 2022, a survey was administered to the regular-day teachers of the students who participated in the FOCUS program. The purpose of the survey was to assess whether the regular-day teacher had observed a change in student performance or behavior related to afterschool programs over the year. We monitor school day behavior, provide counseling sessions and support (during ASP) to help the student make better choices. If a student goes to ISS during the day, we work with the student in ASP time to address the behavior, discuss the situation, and work on strategies for the student to prevent such incidents in the future. Survey responses are summarized below.

- Regular-day teachers who responded to the survey reported that 94% of students involved with the after-school program have improved or maintained acceptable class participation since the beginning of school.
- Regular-day teachers who responded to the survey reported that 80% of students involved with the after-school program have improved their behavior in class or did not need to improve the behavior since the beginning of school.
- Regular-day teachers who responded to the survey reported that many of the students (86%) involved with the after-school program have improved their academic performances since the beginning of school.
- Regular-day teachers who responded to the survey report that 96% of students involved with the after-school program have improved in coming to school ready to learn since the beginning of school.
- Regular-day teachers, who responded to the survey, report that 95% of students involved with the afterschool program have improved or maintained satisfactory completion of homework since the beginning of school.
4.5 Attitudes of Students toward School

In spring of 2022, a survey of attitudes was administered to students who participated in the FOCUS program. The purpose of the survey was to gauge the attitudes of students towards school and whether those attitudes had changed over the year. Survey responses are summarized below. Responses were from students who participated in the FOCUS program and completed the student survey.

- 89% of students who responded to the student survey reported that the after-school program helped them to complete their homework.
- 90% of student respondents reported that they liked their after-school program.
- 72% of students who responded to the student survey reported that the after-school program helped them to improve their behavior.
- 78% of student respondents reported that they are doing better in school.
In spring of 2022, a survey of aptitudes and confidence level was administered to after-school workers who participated in the FOCUS program. The purpose of the survey was to gauge the satisfaction of after-school workers towards professional development opportunities and to determine needs of the after-school workers. Survey responses are summarized in Figure 9. Responses were from after-school workers who participated in the FOCUS program and completed the after-school worker survey.

There were a total of 40 after-school workers in the FOCUS program who completed the survey. After-school workers (98%) indicated they were satisfied with the professional development received during the year.

Figure 9. After-School Worker Survey Results 2022. Source: After-School Workers Survey.
## Status of Program Objectives

The status of each of the program objectives for the 2021-2022 school year is summarized in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>2020 Status</th>
<th>2021 Status</th>
<th>2022 Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 50% of regularly participating students (attending the program 30 days or more) will score at or above the 40+ proficiency percentile on local district assessment for READING/ELA.</td>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>CHMS 9% at or above 40th Percentile CLMS 17% at or above 40th Percentile TMS 23% at or above 40th Percentile FOCUS 18% at or above 40th Percentile Though 65% of students showed growth, those students were below the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 50% of regularly participating students (attending the program 30 days or more) will score at or above the 40+ proficiency percentile on local district assessment for MATH</td>
<td>Waived</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>CHMS 35% at or above 40th Percentile CLMS 54% at or above 40th Percentile TMS 37% at or above 40th Percentile FOCUS 44% at or above 40th Percentile Though 70% of students showed growth, those students were below the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Of the 21st CCLC students participating in the program 30 days or more, 75% will exhibit an annual academic improvement from or maintain (A, B, or C) or (2, 3) in Math as measured by the school report card</td>
<td>Not Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>CHMS 87% increased or A, B, C CLMS 87% increased or A, B, C TMS 70% increased or A, B, C FOCUS 80% increased or A, B, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Of the 21st CCLC students participating in the program 30 days or more, 50% of the participants will exhibit an annual academic improvement, individual student growth with their Reading Lexile’s Scores</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>CHMS 78% Improvement in Lexile Score CLMS 60% Improvement in Lexile Score TMS 66% Improvement in Lexile Score FOCUS 65% Improvement in Lexile Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 At least 80% of 21st CCLC grant students participating in the program 30 days or more will demonstrate improvement or maintain satisfactory homework completion by the end of the school year.</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Regular Day Teachers of students in the FOCUS program indicate that 95% of students improved in homework; 94% of parents; and 89% of students showed improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 At least 80% of 21st CCLC grant students participating in the program 30 days or more will demonstrate improvement or maintain satisfactory behavior by the end of the school year.</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Regular Day Teachers of students in the FOCUS program indicate that 80% of students improved or maintained satisfactory behavior; 77% of parents and 72% of students indicated improved behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 50% of registered and active parents will attend two or more parent sessions per year.</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>74% of Parents attended FOCUS 2 or more times. CHMS – 91%, CLMS – 100%, TMS - 73% as recorded in the APlus system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Of the family members who participate in 3 or more family involvement/education/literacy activities, 50% will report increased engagement</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>As indicated in the Parent Survey, more than 50% of the parents attending 3 or more family involvement activities reported increased engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chestnut Log Middle School

Marquez worked hard on improving his math skills especially since returning to in-person classes. He made sure that his homework was complete and correct before turning it in and frequently sought help from the ASP teachers. When it was time for the individual county math competition, Marquez wanted to participate. He went to the competition and was extremely excited to place second in the county. Marquez’s hard work paid off!

Turner Middle School

Mundy came into the ASP as a student with autism. Through the program she has increased her communication skills and is very excited about attending the program. This year alone she has significantly increased both her reading and math scores because she really enjoys the “hands on” approach to learning.

Another student, Stanley, came to the FOCUS program having to repeat a grade. His learning difficulties appeared to be related to his behavior. Once joining FOCUS, with positive teacher and peer interaction, Stanley started showing concern about disappointing his teachers in both the ASP and day school. When he had a behavior issue, the ASP teachers continued to support him which led to his beginning to work harder in his classes. Stanley began to avoid situations that might get him into trouble and at the end of the year he successfully moved on to the next grade level!

Chapel Hill Middle School

We are proud to announce that four of our FOCUS students made the A/B honor roll during the 1st nine weeks of school. Muhammad shared that it felt really good to get good grades! During the second nine weeks, twelve FOCUS students made the A/B honor roll. Shonda was all smiles when she told her FOCUS teacher about making the A/B honor roll. This was a personal goal she had set for herself. Finally, eight students made the A/B honor roll for the 3rd nine weeks. Being a part of the FOCUS program made a difference!

[All names are pseudonyms.]
During the 2021-2022 school year, the FOCUS program began its third year of program implementation and operation.

### Student Participation

In the FOCUS Program, 164 students were served. The average daily attendance at Chapel Hill Middle School was 20, for Chestnut Log Middle School was 35, and for Turner Middle School was 47. The average attendance rate for students attending 30 or more days was 87%.

### Participation of Adult Family Members

The FOCUS program served 133 adult family members. This year 99 of the 133 parents (74%) indicated that they had attended two or more events this year.

### Student Grades Members

**Mathematics.** At Chapel Hill Middle School, the number of students maintaining an A, B, or C average or increasing their average in math was 87%, an increase from last year’s rate of 65%. At Turner Middle School, the number of students maintaining an A, B, or C average or increasing their average in math was 70%, which was a decrease from last year’s rate of 83%. At Chestnut Log Middle School, the number of students maintaining an A, B, or C average or increasing their average in math was 87% an increase from last year’s rate of 78%.

**English/Language Arts.** Of the students participating in the program 30 days or more, 50% of the students will show an annual academic improvement and individual student growth in their Reading Lexile Scores. At Chapel Hill Middle School, 78% of the students showed an improvement in their Lexile Scores. At Turner Middle School, 66% of the students showed an improvement in their Lexile Scores and at Chestnut Log Middle School 60% showed an improvement in their Lexile Scores. The FOCUS program showed
an overall improvement in the Lexile Scores at 65%. This met the program objective for the 2021-22 school year.

**Student Attitude toward School**

According to responses gathered from the student survey, 89% said that the FOCUS program helped them to complete their homework. Of the student participants, 78% indicated that they are doing better in school since they started coming to the program. 72% of students stated that their overall behavior has improved because of the program. 90% of student respondents reported they liked the program as a whole.

**Adult Family Member Attitudes toward the FOCUS Program**

Based on responses gathered from the parent survey, 94% said that the FOCUS program helped their child to complete their homework; 91% said that the FOCUS program helped their child improve in Reading; and 91% said that the FOCUS program helped their child improve in Math. Additionally, 77% of parents/adult family members stated that the program helped their child’s behavior in school. A total of 97% of parents/adult family members said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the program.

A total of 133 parents/adult family members, were served by the FOCUS program which is an increase from the number last year (102). Of the family members who completed the parent survey, more than 74% indicated that they had attended two or more family activities.
7.2 Areas for Improvement

During this third year of the FOCUS program, the Georgia Milestone testing scores for Math and English/Language Arts were taken and the scores received. FOCUS students, as a group, on the STAR district chosen assessment, met all but two objectives which were related to math scores with a target of 50% at the 40th percentile proficiency level and the English/Language Arts scores with a target of 50% at the 40th percentile proficiency level.

FOCUS students, as a whole, demonstrated achievement at 65% in terms of Mathematics course grades and did meet the objective of 50%. While CLMS exceeded the target with 78%, CHMS matched them with 78%, which is over the target objective. TMS with 66% was the farthest from meeting the target objective.

The students in the Focus Program, overall, demonstrated achievement at 65% on the Reading Lexile scores. TMS scored the highest at 66% and CLMS scored the lowest at 60%.

The STAR Math assessments, the Focus students as whole scored 44% at or above the 40th percentile. TMS scored 37%, CLMS 54%, and CHMS scored 35% at or above the 40th percentile. These scores were slightly below the target of 50% and did not meet the program objective.

The STAR Reading English/Language Arts Assessments, the Focus students overall scored 18% at or above the 40th percentile. CLMS scored 17%, CHMS scored 9%, and TMS scored 23% at or above the 40th percentile. These scores are well below the scores on the previous STAR assessment and did not meet the program objective.
7.3.1 Challenges to Implementation

There were five main challenges for the FOCUS program this year. The site coordinator at Chapel Hill Middle School stated that they struggled to successfully recruit qualified students into the program. There was difficulty getting parents to attend the required orientation and once attended, complete the requisite paperwork for their student to attend. While there is general agreement that a larger than normal learning gap for students exists, it has been difficult to get parents to agree for their students to attend. Chapel Hill Middle School had 23 students who attended for 30 days or more while Chestnut Log and Turner Middle School met their target enrollments of 53/53 and 67/55.

Second, with the return to face-to-face schooling, testing has also been reinstated. The students enrolled in the FOCUS ASP data supports the notion that students have a generally larger learning gap to overcome. This gap might have been caused by a number of reasons including the virtual learning format which may not be conducive to learning for struggling students and possibly a decrease in student engagement because of the inability to provide experiential, hands-on learning. However, it is most likely that the COVID 19 pandemic with the accompanying social and emotional isolation and long periods of screen time created the larger learning gaps that struggling students are experiencing. Teachers also report that it is a struggle to get students to successfully complete work and turn it in. This issue has gotten worse since COVID and it continues to be a challenge to break the habit of not completing and/or turning in work.

Third, several of the FOCUS schools struggled with getting day teachers to commit to working in the ASP. Teacher workloads during the day school have increased because of the learning gap experienced by most students. They are under pressure to increase test scores while struggling to deal with their own social and emotional issues caused by the Pandemic. In the GA DOE document, Teacher Burnout in Georgia: Voices from the Classroom (2022). One teacher stated when interviewed for the study, “The workload is nearly impossible to tackle during the hours we are actually at school.” This leaves few day school teachers, who know the struggling students and their learning issues, to work in the afterschool program as had been the case in previous year. The report documents how teachers are struggling with their own burnout issues including
unrealistic expectations of student engagement as well as their own mental health and wellness. Lack of teachers to work in the ASP creates more stress on the site coordinators to find teachers who can help their students close the learning gap caused by attending virtual school for two-years.

Fourth, several of the FOCUS schools struggled with parental involvement. Middle school parent participant can be challenging because students are seeking independence, not wanting their parents involved in their school program. “Lights on After Dark” was a well-attended on campus student/parent program. Parents spoke of appreciating being back on campus but only about 50% of the parents participated in the programs provided.

Fifth, the social emotional growth and development of students coming back to school from a frequently isolated virtual school experience to in-person learning has been challenging. Students returning to in-person learning may be dealing with trauma related issues such as the illness or death of a family member that might bring on depression and anxiety. Unresolved personal and learning issues may lead to behavioral concerns in the classroom. This is particularly true for middle school students who are beginning to differentiate from parents. Providing a curriculum-based character development program can provide a “safe space” for students to discuss feeling and issues with which they are dealing.

Sixth, ASP staff response on their survey supported the need for additional professional development in math tutoring and enrichment so that the ASP staff can better support students in this area. One respondent wanted more professional development around alignment of the ASP curriculum and the day school curriculum. While only one respondent checked this area, it is an area that can be revisited because of the importance of day school and after school curriculum alignment. Finally, given the social emotional issues that have emerged from two-years of virtual learning due to COVID, providing targeted professional development for staff in the mental health and physical wellness areas should be considered.
7.3.2 Students with Economic Disadvantages

The number of students with economic disadvantages is defined as the number of P-12 students eligible for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), which supports free or reduced-priced meals for eligible students. In the fiscal year, October 2020, at Chapel Hill Middle School, 42.38% of students were NSLP-eligible; at Turner Middle School, 72.24% of students were NSLP-eligible; and, at Chestnut Log Middle School, 71.92% of students were NSLP-eligible. In the Douglas County School District, 55.14% of students were NSLP-eligible this year. These data were provided by the Georgia Department of Education.

7.4 Progress toward Sustainability

The FOCUS site coordinators have actively sought community partners to provide in-kind services not provided by the grant. Due to the pandemic, this year community partners were not as active as the previous year. Active community partnerships reported by the FOCUS program are the following:

Chick-fil-A

Communities in School of Douglas County (3)

DCSS-Food Service (3)

Impact, Inc.

Joseph Woody

Mikki Lucas

TMS 21st CCLC Staff
Recommendations

(1) Recruiting qualified students into the program is of primary importance for all three programs. While Chestnut Log and Turner met their enrollment targets, Chapel Hill Middle School should consider the following: Continue to encourage parents to attend the orientation and complete the requisite paperwork. Since additional means need to be used to get to the parents, consider meeting individually with the parents and completing the paperwork for them while they are in the meeting. Also, consider inviting the parent to an individual orientation meeting while the ASP is in session so that they can see for themselves the support being given to students. If parents cannot make the orientation meeting, consider making a persuasive video of program opportunities, asking other parents in the program who might know them to reach out and provide information on how the program has helped their student.

(2) There is an intense focus for teachers in both the day school and ASP to close the learning gap created by virtual learning and COVID 19. It is recommended that the site coordinator and the staff continuously review the STAR data and any additional formative data to identify specific, individualized learning gaps students may be experiencing. Identifying and utilizing individualized approaches to closing the gaps through small group tutoring has shown to be the most effective and efficient way to meet student’s lagging learning needs. This approach also allows the teachers to stay aware of who has assignments that have not been completed and which assignments have not been submitted. Taking an intentional, consistent approach to classwork and homework completion over time will further support student’s re-entry to in-person learning and should lessen teacher frustration. When working with struggling middle school students, ASP staff are encouraged to focus on student strengths, not deficits and build from there. Taking an asset-based approach builds student resiliency while encouraging students to strengthen academic skills.

Research has shown that the most effective intervention for students who have fallen behind is intensive tutoring (Education Week, 2020) which can be
provided in small skills-based groups. Additionally, research suggests that using paraprofessionals and volunteers can be an effective way to provide on-on-one affordable intensive tutoring. By providing intentional, targeted experiential, hands-on learning activities to support overarching concepts particularly in literacy and STEM areas, in a small group setting, learning gaps have the highest probability of being closed.

(3) Consider requesting a change in Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 from “50% of regularly participating students (attending the program 30 days or more) will score at or above the 40+ proficiency percentile on local district assessments for Reading/ELA and Math" to “50% of the students will show growth in the Reading/ELA and math scores from baseline to end of year assessment.

(4) The FOCUS ASP has struggled with a decrease in staff participation. There are several possible reasons for teachers not wanting to work in the ASP at this time. Pressure to close the learning gaps are being felt by both day and ASP teachers alike. Research shows that stress and anxiety have quadrupled for teachers in general. Teachers report feeling “burned out” and overwhelmed. Keeping these concerns in mind, develop ways to continue to engage day school faculty in the ASP. Reimagine ways to connect day teachers by allowing them to work one or two hours at a time directly after school. Intentionally remaining connected to day teachers who have previously worked in the ASP will provide an easier way to return and teach in the program once teachers are feeling less stressed. Additionally, consider reaching out to retired teachers from the community who might be interested in returning to work in the ASP.

(5) Re-engaging parents in the ASP will take some time. Keep in mind that they are dealing with the same stress and anxiety teachers and students are experiencing with the additionally pressure of inflation. Often parents have to work more than one job preventing them from full participation. Consider recording in-person parent programs so that those who have to work can still gain information from the program. Keep in mind that frequently it is circumstances that prevent full participation in family programming.

Additionally, middle school students are beginning to seek independence from their parents which can negatively impact parent participation. Consider providing parent activities that include student presentations or
performances. Also, consider activities that require that student and parent to work collaboratively together can be helpful.

(6) Research shows that school closures have been especially difficult for U.S. students who are living with serious emotional or behavior difficulties such as depression, anxiety, autism and trauma-related conditions. Schools often serve as one of the most important institutions that address children’s mental health needs (EdNC, 2021). For instance, students who have been learning virtually, in isolation, and return to the classroom may not be ready to meet the interpersonal challenges required by in-person attendance. Dealing with trauma related issues that occurred during the pandemic, such as the illness or death of a family member can be ongoing for students. Continue to provide curriculum-based learning programs in the ASP for social emotional learning, while providing research-based activities to discuss student interpersonal concerns and develop student awareness around positive mental health. This is most important at the middle school level. Unresolved trauma and personal issues can lead to behavioral issues.

Middle school is where unresolved behavioral issues frequently become apparent. On the Adult Family member survey 77% of the respondents agreed that the ASP had helped their Child’s behavior in school. Of the day school teachers that responded, 80% agreed that the ASP had helped student’s behavior. Of the students, 72% responded that the ASP had helped improve their behavior. Many factors can play into why these responses were low. Awareness of the need for behavioral change is one of the first steps in helping students improve in that area. Providing support through social emotional programming that provides time for students to share and explore their feelings and concerns would be helpful. Providing a parent program on middle school behavioral challenges and concerns along with strategies for improvement would be helpful. Additionally, the low ratings may have resulted from the students not having behavior issues from the perspective of the parent, teacher or student, thus there is nothing to improve upon. School behavior is satisfactory. Approaching students who are “acting out” with kindness and understanding will go a long way as we come out of COVID isolation. It is also important for school districts to provide professional development that will train and equip staff to understand and support positive mental health for their students as well as for themselves.
Sustainability Plan

Realizing that to sustain our program successfully we will need additional funding and support, each school advisory committee will identify potential community partners and alternative funding streams. We will create a diversified plan to expand the overall capacity of the program and to replace state funding gradually. The advisory committee will be an essential part of the process. Additionally, parents, students, and the business community will be involved, as they will serve as integral parts of the process.

Plan Creation. Our plan was derived from our work in previous years with the Finance Project. The first phase consists of two stages beginning with the project director and site coordinators establishing and documenting key background components, such as history and development of the grant, mission and vision, and basic program structure (i.e. activities, staff, meals, transportation, and communication). The second stage of the first phase continues with a close examination of the current programming and future plans.

The plan will address the following questions:

- How are you delivering your 21st CCLC program?
- What activities do you offer and how often?
- Who are key partners in the program and new ones added since original agreements received?
- How do existing partners support program implementation?
- What successes have been seen so far as a result of implementing the afterschool program?
- What unanticipated successes warrant further attention and future planning?

Once the team outlines current program operations, they will map out their future vision. Questions to be addressed include: Where do they see their grant needs in year two, three, and beyond? What activities and strategies will be sustained over the next three years? What adjustments can be made to help save money while not changing core function and target numbers?

Prioritizing existing strategies and activities is essential in this planning process. The grant staff at each school and the advisory committee will work through a matrix to rank their activities on a 5-point scale. The sites will list all the activities currently part of the existing grant and then review and rate them according to importance, with 1 being the least valued and 5 being the most valued in each of the following areas: links to
organizations, evidence of effectiveness, ease of implementation, financial feasibility, and links to school day.

As the grant staff disaggregates scale data, they will identify which activities align with their mission and vision for the future. The grant staff will also need to determine if various stakeholders would see activities as aligning to the grant goals and objectives.

The site coordinators will take the phase one information and conduct similar conversations with grant staff and 21st CCLC advisory committee. The site coordinator will then compare discussions to help create their Phase I Sustainability Plan.

The second phase of the plan will focus on strategic considerations. The project director will work with site coordinators to identify which current trends and community conditions will help sustain the grant at their school. The team will also brainstorm trends and conditions that may inhibit sustainability. A portion of the discussion will focus on the internal capacity to accomplish this work.

Based on the first phase meetings and plans, the team will document the scope of the work and what they intend to sustain and plan to scale down. The team will also document specific strategies and activities to sustain the program as the grant continues and to what degree they aim to sustain these activities in the years after state funding ends.

The third phase of the sustainability plan includes considering a full range of resources (i.e., competencies, financial, political, administrative, and managerial resources to meet long-term goals). The third phase process will map out funding needs, seek funds that best meet those needs, and assess the spending gap to determine new partners needed.

The plan will outline costs in a line item or list formation. This format will show everything that has a cost in order to capture the true cost. The financial sustainability part of the plan will document current resources and the gaps to be filled by describing the resources on hand, including in-kind commitments. The plan will identify the gaps and plans for securing needed resources as well as what strategic partners need to be engaged.

Increasing public awareness of the grant program and its results is another key piece to gaining additional funding. Using student success stories will help market the program. Beginning in year one, program staff will take an active role in marketing and media relations for their programs. Opportunities to spotlight student accomplishments, student progress, and student performances will open doors to the community and help sites share their stories. The more visibility the grant program has, the greater the probability that the student successes will build public awareness. Greater awareness can lead to advocacy for our program, encouraging new partners and funders to commit to partnership agreements.

The final phase will detail specific actions necessary to sustain the 21st CCLC program and provide a timeline for those actions. The joint applicant, CISDC, will work with
other community agencies and district grant teams to identify potential community partners and alternative funding streams to reduce the need for 21st CCLC grant funding as our grants mature. DCSS will continue support through in-kind contributions estimated at over $380,833 per center, which includes use of facilities, utilities, technology equipment, custodial services, personnel cost associated with payroll and percentage of time school administrators spend monitoring the grant at their school.

For years three and four, the advisory committee and site coordinator will work with the local arts council on continuing the artists in education residence at no cost to the district. This creates a $700 savings. The grant staff will also work with local colleges and universities to bring college tours to the schools via virtual trips. This will reduce the need to pay for transportation to the campus. Additional cost saving measures will include combining programs during the summer at central locations to help reduce the transport and staffing cost. Centers will be able to collaborate, blend classes and make better use of resources in the final two years and add to reduced funding. The teams will work to seek new partnerships with local hardware stores for materials to sustain garden projects. Sites will use in-house professional development rather than attending conferences. They will use the School Improvement Specialists for professional development as well. A portion of the sustainability plan will recruit and train volunteers. Volunteers will allow the program to maintain class ratio size as well as providing additional staffing for special projects or enrichment sessions. In the past, we paid a staff member to conduct these duties.

Sustainability will also involve additional grants through Google for Technology Club activities, Wal-Mart for education grants, foundation funding request to GreyStone Power, and Georgia Power for program activities and funding. Examples of potential partners’ roles in sustainability will include: funding staff background check costs and parent engagement event materials, donations of supplies from retailers, and using high school advanced placement students to assist during tutoring times in return for service hours. The sites will work with local law enforcement and fire departments to help donate materials for drug awareness and safety seminars. We plan to work with local colleges and universities with teacher training programs to provide student teachers during the after school program hours to help offset staffing costs. These student teachers could gain course credit for their hours rather than paid compensation. The program manager and site coordinators will seek consultants and technical assistance on creating a long-term sustainability plan. The goal of this training will be to help establish a framework for sustainability which includes (a) self-assessment; (b) ongoing refinement of vision and mission; (c) results orientation; (d) strategic financial planning; (e) building organizational capacity, and (f) advocating for community support.

As part of our initial grant writing process, we met with partners about our grant application. We began the process by establishing partnership agreements. The intent of these agreements was to outline how our partners plan to support our grant. The
partnerships listed in Table A-1 include a list of new partners we feel are necessary for our sustainability efforts.

Table A-1
Potential Partners for Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Community Stakeholders</th>
<th>Strategic Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County School System</td>
<td>Help students who are having academic challenges to be successful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities In Schools of Douglas County</td>
<td>Connect community resources to schools to help young people successfully learn, stay in school and prepare for life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>The local business community is invested to achieve a stronger workforce.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Would like to see students involved in healthy alternatives so they can avoid the negative influences and the temptation to be involved in juvenile delinquency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Department and local medical centers (WellStar and Tanner)</td>
<td>Would like students to make healthy decisions about tobacco and addictive substances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE (The Georgia Family Connection site for Douglas County)</td>
<td>The goal is to strengthen Douglas County Families and Youth into making healthy decisions so the youth can become productive contributing members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Justice</td>
<td>Desires a decrease in the number of students who enter the Juvenile Justice system annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners in Education (PIE) of Douglas County</td>
<td>Through healthy business partnerships with schools PIE seeks to inspire students to do well in school and instill hope about future job and post-secondary opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sustainability Timeline

**July-August:** Review grant, begin Phase I of Sustainability Plan
**September – October:** Meet with staff and advisory committee
**November-December:** Work on Phase II of Sustainability Plan
**January-February:** Establish new partners, review program evaluation to determine program changes and summer plans
**March:** Work on Phase III of Sustainability Plan
**April-May:** Work on Phase IV of plan and contact potential partners
**June-July:** Review data, finalize reports, create marketing materials for advocacy campaign, finalize plan and submit to project director

**Ongoing:** Review and revisit plan each month, make necessary changes, hold forums, meetings with advisory. Contact new partners and map out their participation level and services.

Other funding streams and revenue sources may also include a sliding fee structure which must be introduced to parents in year four. The introduction will be part of the parent meetings as we inform them of the grant’s funding ending. This will help parents begin the planning process for year six when state funding is no longer available.

Sustainability may also include reducing the number of days per week in year six and future years. The program could operate with volunteers two days a week, in collaboration with the fee-based program one day a week, and use grant funds raised for the fourth day. The program might not operate on Friday depending on funding availability. Transportation is the largest part of the funding cost aside from personnel. The district does not provide after-school transportation and parents will have to pick up their child from the program. The program could offer a later pick up time to help accommodate parents as needed. Additionally, each school offers a few clubs during the week.

Fee structures might begin in year four with each site asks for a suggested registration fee of $10.00 or $20 per child. This could generate approximately $500-$1,000 for program services. The registration fee could then be added for the second year of $20 per semester.

The key is to raise money for program services without turning away or preventing children from participating. Charging a reasonable and affordable registration fee of $25-$30 per child for the summer program would help offset expenses related to trips or other summer-specific activities, which are current supported with state funding.

Partner contributions and donations will be a critical part of the sustainability as well. We intend to seek $1,500 grants from Walmart, Georgia Power, and GreyStone Power. Additionally, we will seek $2,500 from McMaster Carr to help support program components. The staff will work in year four to write the Google grant asking for $25,000 for activities focusing on technology integration and use in after-school programs.

We will also plan school-level fundraisers, such as parent night out or a Breakfast with Santa type event. Our goal is to raise approximately $1,500-$5,000 throughout the year. We would seek volunteers to help staff the event and local grocery stores to help donate the snacks. The in-kind value is estimated at $500 for refreshments.

Schools, staff, parents and stakeholders will be essential in the planning process to ensure that grant sustainability occurs after we no longer receive state support for the project.